

**BLAKELY** 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
**SOKOLOFF** SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94085  
**TAYLOR &** (408) 720-8300 (Telephone)  
**ZAFMAN** (408) 720-8383 (Facsimile)

A LIMITED LIABILITY  
PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING  
LAW CORPORATIONS

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET (TRANSMITTAL TO PTO)**

Deliver to: Examiner Abul K. Azad - Art Unit 2654  
Firm Name: U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Fax Number: 703-746-5728 Telephone No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
From: Jordan M. Becker  
Date: 5/17/2004 Time: \_\_\_\_\_  
Operator: Julie Arango Matter: 003932.P014  
Number of pages including cover sheet: 5  
In Re Patent Application of: Matthew Lennig et al.  
Application No.: 09/576,116  
Filed: May 22, 2000  
For: Prosody Based Endpoint Detection

Enclosed are the following documents:

☒ Draft - Not to be Entered on the Record - Proposed Response to Final Office  
Action (4 pgs.)

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on:

Date of Transmission May 17, 2004

Julie Arango

(Typed or printed name of person transmitting paper)

Julie Arango 5/17/04  
(Signature of person transmitting paper)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE**

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP that is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

IF YOU EXPERIENCE ANY DIFFICULTY IN RECEIVING THE ABOVE PAGES, PLEASE CALL (408) 720-8300 AND ASK FOR THE OPERATOR NAMED ABOVE.

(Rev. 11/23/97)

**DRAFT – NOT TO BE ENTERED ON THE RECORD**

Proposed Response to Final Office Action  
for  
Application no. 09/576,116, filed on May 22, 2000  
of Lennig et al.

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 5, 2004, please reconsider the present application in view of the following remarks.

Applicant respectfully submits that the statements made in the Examiner's "Response to Arguments" in the Final Office Action (pages 8-9) are clearly wrong. The Examiner has misinterpreted the Lee reference. Applicant maintains the arguments raised in the Amendment filed on February 20, 2004 (pages 12-16), and those arguments are incorporated herein by reference.

Independent Claims 8, 31 and 39

In paragraph 9 (page 8) of the Final Office Action, the Examiner refers to Applicant's argument that Lee only discloses using statistical (probable) minimum and maximum durations of a typical syllable, not using the duration of the final syllable of an utterance for endpoint detection (Amendment filed Feb. 20, 2004, p. 13, last paragraph). Specifically, the Examiner's response is:

The examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion because Lee teaches to detect the endpoint of an utterance based on several factors, including duration of each syllable in the utterance, where final syllable also includes in the start to end of the whole utterance of speech (see col. 10, lines 24-28).